



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/742,322

12/19/2003

Jonas Ekmark

810707094

5774

28549

7590

04/09/2007

ARTZ & ARTZ, P.C.

28333 TELEGRAPH ROAD, SUITE 250  
SOUTHFIELD, MI 48034

EXAMINER

WEISKOPF, MARIE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3661

SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
----------------------------------------	-----------	---------------

3 MONTHS

04/09/2007

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No. 10/742,322	Applicant(s) EKMARK ET AL.	
	Examiner Marie A. Weiskopf	Art Unit 3661	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 January 2007.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**.                      2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1 and 3-12 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1, 3-12 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All    b) ☐ Some \*    c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).
- \* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |                                                                                                            |                                                                                         |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)                                | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                       | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application                       |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____                                                |

## DETAILED ACTION

### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103*

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1 and 3-12 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Byers et al (US 20020107621) in view of Andonian et al (US 6,681,881).

Per claim 1, Byers teaches a method of controlling a steering assembly of a vehicle including analyzing a current vehicle driving-scenario as indicated by signals from a plurality of sensors (24, 26, 28; figure 3), determining a desired steering wheel resist torque that should be felt by a driver of the vehicle (120, figure 3), sensing an actual steering wheel resist torque that is felt by the driver (36, figure 3), comparing the actual steering wheel resist torque with the desired torque (page 3, [0024]), calculating a steering assist force which is required to be applied to the steering assembly in order to make the actual steering wheel resist torque substantially equal to the desired steering wheel resist torque (page 3, [0024]), and activating a motor to apply the steering assist force to the steering assembly (page 3, [0024]). Byers teaches receiving signals of a vehicle speed (28, figure 3) and a steering wheel rotation angle (20, figure 3), but not a third signal from the recited group. There are many other relevant signals that a control system can monitor and use in a control system for vehicle steering. One such parameter is vehicle yaw rate. Systems known to one of ordinary skill in the art at

Art Unit: 3661

the time of the invention measure and take yaw rate and/or lateral acceleration into account in steering reaction control systems, see for example Andonian et al. (Column 3, lines 12-Column 4, line 22) It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to take into account another parameter that is known to be relevant in the art of steering control systems, as exemplified by the teaching of Andonian et al.

Per claim 3, Byers teaches applying an inverse model filter function (see figure 2).

Per claim 4, Byers teaches calculating a preliminary assist force and an adjustment to the force (page 2, [0021]).

Per claim 5, Byers teaches that the filter can allow disturbances to be minimized, if desired (page 2, [0020]).

Per claim 6, Byers teaches activating a motor to apply the steering assist force to the steering assembly (page 3, [0024]).

Per claim 7, Byers teaches a control system for a steering assembly of a vehicle including a plurality of sensors (24, 26, 28; figure 3), a generator for receiving the sensor signals and calculating a desired steering wheel resist torque that should be felt by a driver of the vehicle (120, figure 3), a torque estimator sensing an actual steering wheel resist torque that is felt by the driver (31, figure 3), a comparator for calculating a difference between the actual steering wheel resist torque with the desired torque (page 3, [0024]), at least one controller calculating a steering assist force which is required to be applied to the steering assembly in order to make the actual steering wheel resist

Art Unit: 3661

torque substantially equal to the desired steering wheel resist torque (page 3, [0024]), and a motor to apply the steering assist force to the steering assembly (page 3, [0024]). Byers teaches receiving signals of a vehicle speed (28, figure 3) and a steering wheel rotation angle (20, figure 3), but not a third signal from the recited group. There are many other relevant signals that a control system can monitor and use in a control system for vehicle steering. One such parameter is vehicle yaw rate. Systems known to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention measure and take yaw rate and/or lateral acceleration into account in steering reaction control systems, see for example Andonian et al. (Column 3, lines 12-Column 4, line 22). It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art, at the time of invention, to take into account another parameter that is known to be relevant in the art of steering control systems, as exemplified by the teaching of Andonian et al.

Per claim 8, Byers teaches applying an inverse model filter function (see figure 2).

Per claims 9 and 12, Byers teaches both feedback control (36, figure 1a) and feedforward control (input from the road wheel system 16, figure 1a).

Per claim 10, Byers teaches calculating a preliminary assist force and an adjustment to the force (page 2, [0021]).

Per claim 11, Byers teaches that the filter can allow disturbances to be minimized, if desired (page 2, [0020]).

***Response to Arguments***

3. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1 and 7 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

***Conclusion***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Marie A. Weiskopf whose telephone number is (571) 272-6288. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday between 7:00 AM and 5:30 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Thomas Black can be reached on (571) 272-6956. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

MW

  
GARY CHIN  
PRIMARY EXAMINER